

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 7, 2005, the Office rejected claims 1-6, 15-18 and 21-25 variously pursuant to provisions 35 U.S.C. §102 over the references of Banner and Lowe. Still further, claims 1-6 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

No comment was made in the recent Office Action regarding whether the drawings were either accepted or objected to by the Examiner.

In the absence of any indication to the contrary, Applicant assumes that the earlier filed drawings are acceptable by the Office.

The Office has indicated in the recent Office Action that claims 7-14 are allowed over the art of record. Additionally, the Office noted that claim 19 and claim 24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome any rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 19 and 24 consistent with the helpful suggestions of the Office and therefore, Applicant is of the view that claims 19, 20, 24, and 25 are allowable over the art of record. Favorable action with respect to these additional claims is requested in the Office's next action. Applicant hereby cancels claims 1-6; 15-18; and 21-23, respectively.

Applicant has presented new claims 26 and 27 with this response. It is believed that claims 26 and 27 are allowable over the art of record, and are consistent with the statement for the reasons of allowance as set forth in paragraph 5 of the recent Office Action. Favorable action with respect to claims 26 and 27 is also requested in the Office's next action. As the Office will note by reviewing claims 26 and 27, these claims all recite an anchor assembly including individual portions each having inwardly facing surfaces

which lie in force transmitting relation, one relative to the other, when the anchor assembly is disposed in a deployed position. This feature does not appear to be disclosed or taught in any of the prior art references of record.

In view of the foregoing, it would appear that this application is now in condition for allowance and prompt Notice of Allowance of claims 7-14, 19-20, and 24-27 are respectfully requested in the Office's next action.


Applicant, by and through their counsel, would request that the Office telephone the attorneys in the event that a further telephone conference could expedite the prompt handling of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY E. LOWE

Dated: 7 Sept 05

By: _____


George G. Grigel
Reg. No. 31,166